

REMARKS

By the present amendment, claim 10 has been amended to clarify that the easy-releasing protective member has the ink information for identification, the easy-releasing protective member is provided on at least one side of front side and back side on the optical material, and the optical transmittance is that of a portion of the easy-releasing protective member.

Claims 10-51 are pending in the present application. Claims 10 and 30 are the only independent claims.

In the Office Action, claims 10-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as indefinite. It is alleged in the Office Action that the location of the portion without ink is unclear.

Claim 10 has been amended to clarify in particular that (i) the protective member has the ink information, and (ii) the protective member is provided on at least one side of the optical material (as explained in particular on page 15, last paragraph of the description). Accordingly, it is submitted that the rejection should be withdrawn.

Next, in this Office Action, claims 10-11, 13-21, 25-30, and 32-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over US 6,063,174 to Shirota et al. ("Shirota") in view of US 6,654,085 to Koike et al. ("Koike"), claims 22-24 and 41-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Shirota in view of Koike and further in view of US 4,812,034 to Mochizuki et al. ("Mochizuki"), and claims 12 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Shirota in view of Koike and further in view of US 5,856,048 to Tahara et al. ("Tahara").

It is alleged in the Office Action that it would have been obvious "to modify the multilayer optical element of Shirota to include an easy-releasing protective member because Koike teaches that such a easy-releasing protective member is required for transfer purposes like to a liquid

crystal display for instance” (Office Action, paragraph bridging pages 3-4).

The rejections are respectfully traversed. Koike only discloses protective films that are released prior to assembling optical layers into optical elements (see Example 2 of Koike, to which reference is made in the Office Action). In other words, the protective films of Koike are intended to protect the optical elements before their assembly into an optical display, but are never present in the optical display. As a result, Koike does not provide any motivation to provide any portion of the color filter of Shirota in the form of an easy-release film, since the color filter of Shirota is not designed to be removed like the protective films of Koike, but is designed to be assembled in the optical display like the optical films of Koike.

Conversely, Shirota does not provide any motivation to provide the protective films of Koike in the form of color filters, since the protective films are removed and are never integrated into an optical display, as a result of which there would have been no interest in providing unneeded color filter properties to the protective films of Koike.

In summary, there would have been no motivation to combine Shirota and Koike, and any combination of Shirota and Koike would have provided an easy-release protective film without identification information, as taught in Koike.

In contrast, in the presently claimed invention, the easy-releasing protective member has an ink information for identification or an identification information, as recited in present claims 10 and 30, respectively. An advantage of this construction is that the ink portion or identification information of the protective film can be designed to provide an information for the identification of the optical element, while avoiding to confer optical properties in a display device. Thus, the identification information of the easy-release protective film can identify the optical element

before the protective film is removed at the time of assembling the optical element in a display.

This feature of the presently claimed invention and its advantages are not taught in Shirota, which only discloses an ink material on a non-releasable color filter, or in Koike, which only discloses a protective film without ink material. Further, the other cited references fail to remedy these deficiencies of Shirota and Koike. Therefore, the present claims are not obvious over any combination of the cited references.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the rejections should be withdrawn.

In conclusion, the invention as presently claimed is patentable. It is believed that the claims are in allowable condition and a notice to that effect is earnestly requested.

In the event there is, in the Examiner's opinion, any outstanding issue and such issue may be resolved by means of a telephone interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.


Serial Number: 10/056,973

Group Art Unit: 1774

In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicants hereby petition for an appropriate extension of the response period. Please charge the fee for such extension and any other fees which may be required to our Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP


Nicolas E. Seckel
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 44,373

Atty. Docket No.: 020611

Customer No.: 38834

1250 Connecticut Avenue NW Suite 700

Washington, D.C. 20036

Tel: (202) 822-1100

Fax: (202) 822-1111

NES:rep